

George Jordan, the Actor, in London.
DIFFICULTY BETWEEN GEORGE JORDAN, AN ACTOR OF THE STAGE, AND MARY BOUCICAULT ON THE RIGHTS OF MARRIAGE.

Sittings at the Court of Queen's Bench, London, May 12.

Jordan vs. Gibson.—This was an action brought by the plaintiff to recover compensation in damages for assault and false imprisonment. The defendant pleaded a justification.

Mr. Sergeant Parry and Mr. Montague Williams were counsel for the plaintiff; Mr. Karlake, Q. C., for the defendant.

Mr. Sergeant Parry, in opening the plaintiff's case, said the plaintiff was at present a comedian at the Lyceum Theatre. He was a gentleman who had for many years resided with his wife in America, where they practiced the law. In 1852, he came to England, and resided in Edinburgh until February, 1858. In the year last they came to England, and he obtained an engagement at the Princess' theatre, whilst his wife, contrary to his wishes, accepted an engagement which would have him a colonel in her husband's service. This so annoyed the man that he determined to revenge himself in some method. So they set fire to the buildings on the island. These being constructed of wood, it was a very simple operation to totally destroy them. The plaintiff had given down a large dwelling house upon the island, but failed in the attempt, the flames being speedily extinguished.

Yesterday, however, the paymaster went upon the island and paid them, when their grievances were at an end.

Military Outbreak at Riker's Island—The Barracks Burned Down, &c.

The First Metropolitan cavalry regiment, quartered at Riker's Island, and which now numbers about two hundred and fifty men, set fire to their barracks and headquarters on Tuesday evening last, when the whole concern was burned to the ground. The cause for this outrage is stated to be the non-payment to the men of their state bounties. Most of them have large families, and the delay occasioned in paying those bounties has necessarily entailed much suffering upon their wives and little ones. This so annoyed the men that they determined to revenge themselves in some method. So they set fire to the buildings on the island. These being constructed of wood, it was a very simple operation to totally destroy them. The plaintiff had given down a large dwelling house upon the island, but failed in the attempt, the flames being speedily extinguished.

Yesterday, however, the paymaster went upon the island and paid them, when their grievances were at an end.

The Returning Regiments.

DESCRIPTION OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH REGIMENT NEW YORK STATE VOLUNTEERS.

A meeting to make preparations for the reception of the thirty-seventh regiment New York State Volunteers was held last evening at the Astor House. Among those present were Lieutenant Colonel Minion, First regiment, National Guard; Captain O'Brien, Thirty-seventh New York State Volunteers; Captain Maguire, Thirty-seventh; Captain Keefe, Sixty-ninth; Lieutenant Dusenbury, Thirty-seventh; National Guard as others. After some preliminary remarks, the commanding officer made a speech to his (the plaintiff's) wife at her lodgings, and he thereupon, with a gentleman named Jameson, repaired to the house in nail-mit. They walked in the streets for some time, and stopped about two o'clock in the afternoon, having deposited a lady who the plaintiff believed was his wife, then drove up King street, St. James'. Mr. Jameson remained walking the house whilst the plaintiff remained in the carriage. When the plaintiff reached the carriage stopped in front of Mr. Boucicault's office, he returned to Mr. Jameson, and after watching the house for some time a lady appeared at an open window, as if watching for someone. After a long wait a few minutes later a man and a woman came out of the house and walked up and down in front of the house until the lady opened the door and let him in. The plaintiff immediately walked up to the door, and finding it shut knocked, and it was opened by his wife. The plaintiff said, "I am here to see that you do not do me wrong; I am here for Heaven's sake don't expose me." The plaintiff then went up stairs and searched his wife's rooms, but could not find Mr. Boucicault. He then went to the room of the defendant, and was received with a smile. He inquired to the defendant what he was to do. The defendant, who occupied that part of apartments, informed the plaintiff what he was there for, and the defendant said he must regard him as a spy. He proceeded to do what was asked, but he could not find Mr. Boucicault in either of the other rooms. The plaintiff, upon this, considered that the defendant had conspired with Mr. Boucicault for the latter's safety. He inquired of the defendant what he intended to do with him, and he informed the defendant to allow him to remain that he might be able to get to Boucicault out of the house. The plaintiff, at that time made his appearance upon the landing, and the defendant refused the plaintiff any satisfaction whatever, and ordered him out of the house. He refused to go until he was seen Mr. Boucicault, and the plaintiff then left. A policeman then came upon the scene, and the defendant ordered him to remove the plaintiff. The policeman refused to do so, alleging that he had no authority, and the plaintiff then pulled out his revolver and threatened the policeman's safety. He was conveyed to the vice-station police station, where the plaintiff was charged with creating a disturbance in the house No. 69 Pall Mall; but the defendant when he was asked to sign the charge sheet, said, "I will not sign it, for I do not know the charge." The learned sergeant, in concluding his evidence to the jury, said that the matter had been the subject of conversation throughout the whole of the profession of which the plaintiff was a member. It was a question of whether it was right or wrong to expose the jury to revere moderate—he would not ask for excessive—damages for the purpose of vindicating his character.

The plaintiff was called, and corroborated the learned sergeant's opening.

In cross-examination he said Mr. Jameson did not go with him to the police station; he was there about ten minutes; he met him as he was going out. Jameson did not say he was sorry that witness had used such abusive language. The plaintiff said he was sorry he had given his right to the defendant, and he was very sorry if the lady had been annoyed in any manner; he was not more excited than any man would be expected to be under similar circumstances. The defendant said to the plaintiff he was separated from his wife about a week ago, and this occurrence, he heard previously to his going to the house that Mr. Boucicault was carrying on a illicit intercourse with witness's wife; but she would not allow him to remain upstairs. Witness did not say upon leaving the police station that he would not be held liable if the defendant had come to the police station to accuse him, and had removed him to the police station to enable Mr. Boucicault to escape. Mrs. Jordan had since returned to America.

Colonel Daly, 47, proved that he was called into the house to take the plaintiff into custody. He refused to do so on his own responsibility, and the defendant thereafter said he would give him into custody.

The plaintiff said he was anxious to know what amount was removed from this house," witness said, "Why?" The defendant replied, "He is creating a disturbance, and refuses to leave." At the police station Colonel Gibson said he would prosecute the charge if the plaintiff professed to be the author of the disturbance. The plaintiff promised not to do so, and the parties then left the station house; witness saw no more of them after that hour.

This, in speaking of the defense to the city court, he said that the plaintiff had been removed from the house, he was not engaged in an altercation with Mrs. Clark, the landlady, when the defendant made his appearance on the landing. It was very likely that he made his appearance on the landing, and, according to the evidence, found Mr. Jordan taking care of the house at the direction of the landlady. Mrs. Clark, the facts as presented to him by the defendant returned from the Army and Navy Club to his lodgings at the house in question, and when he met her he said, "I am here to see that the defendant has committed a wrong, and that without his wife he would not be able to do it." The plaintiff then entered into a conversation respecting the plaintiff's wife, and the plaintiff promised to call upon the landlady the next morning, and express his sorrow. If he had made her angry, he would have done all he could to make amends. The defendant then said, "Now you have got me into trouble, and I am afraid I will be sent to prison." The plaintiff said, "I am not afraid of that. Our friends will see that you are not sent to prison." The defendant answered, and on the following day he received the writ in this action. The learned counsel contended that if the facts as above were proved to the satisfaction of the court, he would be entitled to a judgment for a disbursement in the house of Mrs. Clark, who was an uneducated lady, her husband being at the time so ill as to be unable to attend to any business. The plaintiff had no right to sue for damages for the expenses, for which he might have been compelled to pay, to defend him. Then the rooms on the third floor were the apartments of the defendant, and for the purpose of the action if the plaintiff was committing a trespass there the former had a right to eject him, and it was on those grounds that the learned counsel asked for a verdict for the plaintiff.

Colonel Gibbons was called, and corroborated the learned counsel's opening.

In cross-examination he said Mr. Jameson did not go with him to the police station; he was there about ten minutes; he met him as he was going out. Jameson did not say he was sorry that witness had used such abusive language. The plaintiff said he was sorry he had given his right to the defendant, and he was very sorry if the lady had been annoyed in any manner; he was not more excited than any man would be expected to be under similar circumstances. The defendant said to the plaintiff he was separated from his wife about a week ago, and this occurrence, he heard previously to his going to the house that Mr. Boucicault was carrying on a illicit intercourse with witness's wife; but she would not allow him to remain upstairs. Witness did not say upon leaving the police station that he would not be held liable if the defendant had come to the police station to accuse him, and had removed him to the police station to enable Mr. Boucicault to escape. Mrs. Jordan had since returned to America.

Colonel Daly, 47, proved that he was called into the house to take the plaintiff into custody. He refused to do so on his own responsibility, and the defendant thereafter said he would give him into custody.

The plaintiff said he was anxious to know what amount was removed from this house," witness said, "Why?" The defendant replied, "He is creating a disturbance, and refuses to leave." At the police station Colonel Gibson said he would prosecute the charge if the plaintiff professed to be the author of the disturbance. The plaintiff promised not to do so, and the parties then left the station house; witness saw no more of them after that hour.

This, in speaking of the defense to the city court, he said that the plaintiff had been removed from the house, he was not engaged in an altercation with Mrs. Clark, the landlady, when the defendant made his appearance on the landing. It was very likely that he made his appearance on the landing, and, according to the evidence, found Mr. Jordan taking care of the house at the direction of the landlady. Mrs. Clark, the facts as presented to him by the defendant returned from the Army and Navy Club to his lodgings at the house in question, and when he met her he said, "I am here to see that the defendant has committed a wrong, and that without his wife he would not be able to do it." The plaintiff then entered into a conversation respecting the plaintiff's wife, and the plaintiff promised to call upon the landlady the next morning, and express his sorrow. If he had made her angry, he would have done all he could to make amends. The defendant then said, "Now you have got me into trouble, and I am afraid I will be sent to prison." The plaintiff said, "I am not afraid of that. Our friends will see that you are not sent to prison." The defendant answered, and on the following day he received the writ in this action. The learned counsel contended that if the facts as above were proved to the satisfaction of the court, he would be entitled to a judgment for a disbursement in the house of Mrs. Clark, who was an uneducated lady, her husband being at the time so ill as to be unable to attend to any business. The plaintiff had no right to sue for damages for the expenses, for which he might have been compelled to pay, to defend him. Then the rooms on the third floor were the apartments of the defendant, and for the purpose of the action if the plaintiff was committing a trespass there the former had a right to eject him, and it was on those grounds that the learned counsel asked for a verdict for the plaintiff.

Colonel Gibbons was called, and corroborated the learned counsel's opening with respect to the part which he took in the trial of this cause. The learned counsel was very violent and excited, and, according to the evidence, for the purpose of funding Mr. Boucicault. Had he been less violent witness would have opened the bedroom which was locked for Mr. Jordan. When he got into the bedroom he found the bed in question was empty. When he returned it was not there. It must have been taken from the inside. He never aided Mr. Boucicault in his securities in the house.

Colonel Gibbons was called, and said—It was late at night when the plaintiff came to the house, all the inmates were in bed with the exception of Mrs. Jordan and Col. Gibbons. When she met Mr. Jordan on the landing he was in a very excited state. He at once pushed her aside, and she was very nearly thrown down when he was.

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The jury said they were satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston. The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to the jury—First, were they satisfied with the account given by the plaintiff, who said he was passing through the city on his way to Boston? Second, did the plaintiff have a right to recover the damages he sustained?

The learned counsel left two questions to